APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,129	11/25/2003	Cara L. Iddings	IGT1P317/AC042	9452

79646   7590   03/04/2009
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT
Attn: IGT
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER
SHRESTHA, BIJENDRA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 October 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16,19-23 and 25-41_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16,19-23 and 25-41_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _10/21/2008_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-41 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on

10/21/2008 amending claims 1,6, 8-9, 17, 19, 22, 37 and 40, and canceling claims 18

and 24. After careful consideration of applicant's arguments and amendments, new

grounds of rejections of the claims necessitated by Applicant's amendment are

established in the instant application as set forth in detail below. Applicant's arguments

with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s)

of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made

2.   Claims 1, 3-5, 8 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Tracy, U.S. Patent No. 5,280,909 (reference A in attached PTO-892)

in view of Mothwurf et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,712,695 (reference B in attached PTO-

892).

3.   As per claim 1, Tracy teaches a method for authorizing a manual payment of a

gaming jackpot (see column 1, lines 43-54), comprising:

receiving a jackpot winning signal from a gaming machine, said jackpot

signal including a jackpot value of a player (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where

communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming

machine 10 and ASCI "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a

payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value (see column 6, lines 62-68;

where controller 11 conveys payout and control signal to gaming machine enabling itself

to make payout);

generating a confirmed jackpot value if the jackpot value of the jackpot

winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the transaction signal (see

Fig. 1; column 2, line 68 to column 3, lines 1-8; where communication unit 26 transmit

to particular game unit confirming current value of the jackpot hit);

authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a

requirement for a corroborating payment witnessing user, and creating a record of the

authorized transfer (see column 7, lines 25-30); and

creating a record of the authorized transfer (see Fig. 1; memory (22); column 4,

lines 61-68 to column 5, lines1-3; 38-42; where Current Value of Jackpot (JPc) is reset

to Initial Jackpot Value (JPi) to establish Jackpot Value for next game cycle).

Tracy does not <u>teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and</u>

<u>payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to</u>

<u>generate jackpot value</u>.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and

payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to

generate jackpot value (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and

payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to

generate jackpot value of Tracy because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features

would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing

profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

4.   As per claims 3-5, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 1 as described

above. Tracy further teaches the method of comprising:

suspending said gaming machine to prevent further gaming play thereon;

transferring the confirmed jackpot value to the player; and releasing the gaming

machine to permit gaming play thereon (see column 5, lines 31-50; where CPU 21

resets the jackpot payout value foe new machine cycle after jackpot payment has been

made).

5.   As per claim 8, Tracy teaches an article comprising a storage medium, said

storage medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a computing

device (see Fig, memory (22); CPU (21)), result in:

receiving a jackpot winning signal from a gaming machine, said jackpot

signal including a jackpot value of a player (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where

communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming

machine 10 and ASCI "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value (see column 6, lines 62-68; where controller 11 conveys payout and control signal to gaming machine enabling itself to make payout);

generating a confirmed jackpot value if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the transaction signal (see Fig. 1; column 2, line 68 to column 3, lines 1-8; where communication unit 26 transmit to particular game unit confirming current value of the jackpot hit);

authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a requirement for a corroborating payment witnessing user (see column 7, lines 25-30); and

creating a record of the authorized transfer (see Fig. 1; memory (22); column 4, lines 61-68 to column 5, lines1-3; 38-42; where Current Value of Jackpot (JPc) is reset to Initial Jackpot Value (JPi) to establish Jackpot Value for next game cycle).

Tracy does not teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate jackpot value.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate jackpot value (Mothwurf et al., abstract)
Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment

user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate

jackpot value of Tracy because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would

enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and

turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

6.   As per claim 40, Tracy teaches a method for corroborating a gaming machine

jackpot payment, comprising:

        receiving a jackpot signal from the gaming machine, said jackpot signal

corresponding to a jackpot won by a gaming player of a gaming machine and

including a jackpot value (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where communication unit

26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming machine 10 and ASCI "0-

7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

        receiving a jackpot payment request initiated by a jackpot payment user at

the gaming machine, said jackpot payment request including a user identification

signal and a jackpot payment value (see column 6, lines 62-68; where controller 11

conveys payout and control signal to gaming machine enabling itself to make payout);

        determining a jackpot payment authorization for the jackpot payment user;

comparing the jackpot value and the jackpot payment value (see Fig. 1; column 2, line

68 to column 3, lines 1-8; where communication unit 26 transmit to particular game unit

confirming current value of the jackpot hit);

        authorizing the jackpot payment user to pay the jackpot value to the winning

player at the gaming machine without a jackpot payment corroborating witness if the

jackpot value and the jackpot payment value are equal; paying the jackpot value to the

gaming player (see column 7, lines 25-30); and

storing parameters of the jackpot value payment in a jackpot payment

database (see Fig. 1; memory (22); column 4, lines 61-68 to column 5, lines 1-3; 38-42;

where Current Value of Jackpot (JPc) is reset to Initial Jackpot Value (JPi) to establish

Jackpot Value for next game cycle).

Tracy does not <u>teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and</u>

<u>payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to</u>

<u>generate jackpot value</u>.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and

payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to

generate jackpot value (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment

user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate

jackpot value of Tracy because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would

enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and

turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

7.   Claim 2, 6-7, 9-17, 19-21 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Tracy (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Mothwurf et al.,

U.S. Patent No. 6,712,695 (reference B in attached PTO-892) further in view of

Solomon, U.S. Patent No. 6,892,938 (reference C in attached PTO-892).

8.   As per claim 2, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 1 as described

above. Tracy further teaches creating a record of the authorized transfer as described in

claim 1 above.

        Tracy does not teach printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including

indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a

corroborating payment witnessing user.

        Solomon teaches printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia

indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a corroborating

payment witnessing user (Solomon, column 6, lines 34-35).

        Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt

including indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a

corroborating payment witnessing user of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because

Solomon teaches including above features would enable jackpot payment user to take

ticket to the cashier station s for payment for predetermined limit (Solomon, column 6,

lines 34-38).

9.   As per claims 6-7, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 1 as described

above.

        Tracy does not teach generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the

jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the jackpot transaction value

of the transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the jackpot

value of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment

value; and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the jackpot value of the

jackpot winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum

value.

Solomon teaches generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the jackpot

value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the jackpot transaction value of the

transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the jackpot value

of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value;

and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the jackpot value of the jackpot

winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum value

(Solomon, column 6, lines 28-45; where employee pays jackpot without witness such as

through cash dispensing peripheral for predetermined amount; additional authorization

or witness is required for payment over predetermined value).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the

jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the jackpot transaction value

of the transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the jackpot

value of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment

value; and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the jackpot value of the

jackpot winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum

value of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above

features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-

9).

10.   As per claim 9, Tracy teaches a method for corroborating a gaming machine

jackpot payment, comprising:

generating a jackpot winning signal corresponding to a jackpot won by a

gaming player of a gaming machine, said jackpot winning signal including a jackpot

value (see column 6, lines 62-650;

verifying the jackpot value (see column 5, lines 28-31);

creating a jackpot transaction record indicating authorization of a transfer of the

jackpot value without a corroborating jackpot payment user (see Fig. 1; memory (22);

column 4, lines 61-68 to column 5, lines 1-3; 38-42; where Current Value of Jackpot

(JPc) is reset to Initial Jackpot Value (JPi) to establish Jackpot Value for next game

cycle).; and

authorizing the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning

player without a jackpot payment corroborating witness ((see column 7, lines 25-30).

Tracy does not <u>teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and</u>

<u>payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to</u>

<u>generate jackpot value</u>.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and

payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to

generate jackpot value (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and

payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate jackpot value of Tracy because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

Tracy <u>does not teach comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value; or verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value.</u>

Solomon teaches comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value; or verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value (see Fig. 4: column 6, lines 28-45).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value; or verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot

winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value of Tracy because

Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or

theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

11.   As per claim 10, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. further in view of Solomon

teaches claim 9 as described above.

        Tracy does not teach printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including

indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a

corroborating payment witnessing user.

        Solomon teaches printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia

indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a corroborating

payment witnessing user (Solomon, column 6, lines 34-35).

        Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt

including indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a

corroborating payment witnessing user of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because

Solomon teaches including above features would enable jackpot payment user to take

ticket to the cashier station s for payment for predetermined limit (Solomon, column 6,

lines 34-38).

12.   As per claim 11, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as described

above. Tracy further teaches the method wherein

the jackpot winning signal includes at least one of chronological data or a gaming

machine identifier (see Fig; Gaming machine (2-5); column 6, lines 63-65; where signal

is conveyed to identify gaming machine).

13.   As per claim 12-13, Tracy Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as described above.

Tracy teaches credit the jackpot value to the winning player without a jackpot

payment corroborating witness (see column 7, lines 25-31).

Tracy does not teach determining a jackpot payment user authorization

comprises determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment

user; comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming

machine to a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the

jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player.

Solomon teaches determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises

determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment user;

comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming machine to

a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the jackpot payment

user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player (Solomon, column 2, lines 15-23;

column 7, lines 39-42).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment user authorization

comprises determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment

user; comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming

machine to a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the

jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player of Tracy in view of

Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to

reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

14.   As per claims 14-15, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as

described above.

    Tracy does not teach determining a jackpot payment user authorization

comprises generating a jackpot manual payment permission request for the jackpot

payment user if said jackpot payment user does not have an associated jackpot manual

payment permission; and logging the jackpot manual payment permission request.

    Solomon teaches assigning the jackpot payment transaction to employees of

casino and storing biometric characteristics of the employee (Solomon, Fig. 4, step 52;

Fig. 2, steps 62, 64; column 5, lines 33-54; Examiner interprets assignment of payment

transaction involves processing request for new permission).

    Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment user authorization

comprises generating a jackpot manual payment permission request for the jackpot

payment user if said jackpot payment user does not have an associated jackpot manual

payment permission; and logging the jackpot manual payment permission request of

Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features

would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

15.   As per claims 16-17, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as

described above. Tracy further teaches the method of claim 9, further comprising:

crediting the jackpot value to the winning player; dispensing to the winning player

cash equal to the jackpot value, dispensing to the winning player a check in the amount

of the jackpot value (see column 3, lines 53-56).

Tracy does not teach assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the credit

meter of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to an

account of the winning player.

Solomon teaches assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the credit meter

of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to an account of

the winning player (Solomon, column 3, lines 42-44).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the

credit meter of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to

an account of the winning player t of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because including

above features would enable to reduce the gaming machine operating costs.

16.   As per claim 19, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as described

above.

Tracy does not teach the method wherein the jackpot manual witness payment

value is a selectable value.

Solomon teaches the method wherein the jackpot manual witness payment value

is a selectable value (see column 3, lines 44-50).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the jackpot manual witness payment value is a

selectable value of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including

above features would enable to meet the governmental reporting requirements for

casino to reduce fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

17.   As per claim 20-21, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 9 as described

above.

Tracy does not teach the method comprising storing parameters of the jackpot

value credit authorization in a jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot

value credit authorization include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine

identifier, gaming machine chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier.

Solomon teaches storing parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization in a

jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization

include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine identifier, gaming machine

chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier (Solomon, column 2, lines 18-

23, 30-36).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate storing parameters of the jackpot value credit

authorization in a jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot value credit

authorization include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine identifier,

gaming machine chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier of Tracy in

view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would

enable to reduce the threat of fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

18.   As per claim 41, Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 40 as described

above.

        Tracy <u>does not teach the method comprising receiving a jackpot reimbursement</u>

<u>request from a jackpot payment user at a value station remote from the gaming</u>

<u>machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user identification</u>

<u>signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot reimbursement request</u>

<u>with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction request; authorizing a</u>

<u>reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment user if the user identification</u>

<u>signals match; and printing a jackpot transaction record indicating authorization of a</u>

<u>transfer of the jackpot value without a corroborating jackpot payment user</u>.

        Solomon teaches the method comprising receiving a jackpot reimbursement

request from a jackpot payment user at a value station remote from the gaming

machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user identification

signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot reimbursement request

with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction request; authorizing a

reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment user if the user identification

signals match; and printing a jackpot transaction record indicating authorization of a

transfer of the jackpot value without a corroborating jackpot payment user (Solomon,

abstract).

        Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the method comprising receiving a jackpot

reimbursement request from a jackpot payment user at a value station remote from the

gaming machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user

identification signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot

reimbursement request with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction

request; authorizing a reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment user if

the user identification signals match; and printing a jackpot transaction record indicating

authorization of a transfer of the jackpot value without a corroborating jackpot payment

user of Tracy in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above

features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-

9).

19.   Claims 22-23 and 25-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable by Solomon, U.S Patent No. 6,892,938 (reference C in attached PTO-892)

in view of Mothwurf et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,712,695 (reference B in attached PTO-

892).

20.   As per claim 22, Solomon teaches a method for paying a gaming machine

jackpot, comprising:

        generating a jackpot payment transaction request from a jackpot payment

user, jackpot payment transaction request including a jackpot payment user identifier

and a jackpot payment request value (see Fig. 2; column 2, lines 53-67; where

employee or payment user request payment transaction approval by listing transaction

and identifying him/her using biometric sensor);

authorizing a transfer without a jackpot payment corroborating witness of a

verified jackpot value to a player of said gaming machine (see column 6, lines 34-41;

where cash payment is made at cash dispensing peripheral without corroborating

witness).

printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia that a jackpot

payment corroborating witness is not required for transfer of verified jackpot value (see

column 6, lines 28-38; where witness is not required for payment of jackpot for

predetermined value and additional authorization required for payment over the

predetermined value).

Solomon does not teach verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment

request value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming

machine.

Mothwurf et al. teach verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment request

value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming machine

(Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment

request value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming

machine of Solomon because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would

enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and

turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

21.   As per claim 23, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

        the jackpot signal further includes at least one of a gaming player identity value,

a gaming machine identity value, a chronological value, or gaming outcome data (see

column 7, lines 56-58).

22.   As per claim 25, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein verifying the jackpot

value comprises:

        comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot signal to a maximum jackpot

witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a jackpot payment corroborating

witness if the jackpot value of the jackpot signal is greater than the maximum jackpot

witness-less manual payment value (see Fig. 4; column 27-45; where funds are paid at

jackpot fill station using cash dispensing peripheral without witness for predetermined

amount).

23.   As per claim 26, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

        the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value is a selectable value

(see Fig. 4; column 6, lines 40-45).

24.   As per claim 27, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein verifying the jackpot

value comprises:

comparing the jackpot payment request value of the jackpot payment

transaction request to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and

requiring a jackpot payment corroborating witness if the jackpot payment request value

is greater than the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; else

authorizing the jackpot payment transaction request without a payment corroborating

witness requirement (see Fig. 4: column 6, lines 28-45).

25.   As per claim 28, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 27 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value is a selectable value

(see column 6, lines 28-41; where witness-less manual payment of jackpot is for

predetermined value).

26.   As per claim 29-30, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

verifying the jackpot value comprises correlating the jackpot signal value with the

jackpot payment request value; and rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if

the jackpot signal value is not equal to the jackpot payment request value; and storing

the jackpot payment transaction request rejection (see column 7, lines 39-42; where if

the jackpot payment amount over predetermined amount is rejected unless

authorization another employee or cashier is obtained).

27.   As per claim 31, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 30 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein transferring the jackpot

value comprises

crediting the jackpot value to a player account (see column 3, lines 42-47; where

jackpot payment is credited).

28.   As per claim 32, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

transferring the jackpot value from the jackpot payment user to the gaming

player of said gaming machine (see column 3, lines 43-47; where jackpot payment is

made to gaming player by hand pay, hopper fills or credits).

29.   As per claim 33, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 32 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein transferring the jackpot

value to a player comprises

physically transferring a tangible value medium from the jackpot payment user to

the player (see column 6, lines 33-36; where payment user or employee physically

takes printed ticket to cashier to pay the gaming player).

30.   As per claim 34, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

storing jackpot value transfer data in a jackpot payment data log (see column 3,

lines 44; where examiner interprets crediting the gaming player jackpot payment

involves storing jackpot transfer data).

31.   As per claim 35, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 34 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method of storing jackpot value transfer

data comprises

storing data representing at least one of the jackpot signal or the jackpot

payment transaction request (see Fig. 2; column 2, lines 53-67; where employee or

payment user request payment transaction approval by listing transaction and

identifying him/her using biometric sensor).

32.   As per claim 36, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein authorizing a jackpot

value transfer comprises:

determining if the jackpot payment user has an associated jackpot manual

payment permission; approving the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot

payment user has an associated jackpot manual payment permission (see column 5,

lines 1-6; manual payment of jackpot is permitted after matching sensed biometric

characteristics to stored characteristics of the employee making manual payment); and

assigning a jackpot value transfer authorization code (see column 5, lines 7-17;

where computer 38 print out ticket after matching the biometric characteristics of the

employee signifying the authorization of the manual payment to jackpot winner).

33.   As per claim 37, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 34 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein:

storing jackpot value transfer data comprises storing the jackpot payment

transaction request and the jackpot value transfer authorization code (see column 3,

lines 44; where examiner interprets crediting the gaming player jackpot payment

involves storing jackpot transfer data which includes jackpot payment transaction

request and the jackpot value transfer authorization code).

34.   As per claim 38-39, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 36 as

described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment user

does not have an associated jackpot manual payment permission; comparing the

jackpot payment request value to a jackpot payment value limit associated with the

jackpot payment user; approving the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot

payment request value is equal to or less than the jackpot payment value limit; and

rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment request value

is greater than the jackpot payment value limit (see column 7, lines 39-48; where if

amount of jackpot payment to be made by an employee is over predetermined amount,

additional authorization by another employee is required).

Response to Arguments

35.   After careful consideration of applicant's arguments and amendments, new

grounds of rejections of the claims necessitated by Applicant's amendment are

established in the instant application. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Tracy teaches payout is effected automatically by machine themselves without

the aid of gaming personnel (Tracy, column 7, lines 28-31). Solomon teaches printing a

ticket signifying authorization of a transaction, e.g. payment of jackpot in conventional

manner (Solomon, column 5, lines 15-17).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

36.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosures. The following are pertinent to current invention, though not

relied upon:

Hilgendorf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,249,800 teach progressive gaming control

and communication system.

Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,984,175) teach electronic payout administration

method and system for gaming apparatus.

Nguyen et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0162591) teach player authentication for

cashless gaming machine instruments.

Orus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,580,310) teach games machine with mechanical

counters a laid down by regulations, and with electronic payment mechanism.

Stanek (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0069059) teaches lotto game having jackpot prize

level.

Stern (U.S. Patent No. 6,110,044) teaches method and apparatus for issuing and

automatically validating gaming machine payout tickets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Bijendra K. Shrestha whose telephone number is

(571)270-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:30PM (Monday-

Friday); 2nd Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571)272-6771. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

bks/3691
03/02/2009